UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,406	10/07/2003	Kiyoshige Muraoka	1403-0256P	5490
	7590 05/23/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 3/4 22040 0747	KNABLE, GEOFFREY L		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1791		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/23/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/679,406		MURAOKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Geoffrey L. Knable	1791	

	Geoffrey L. Knable	1791					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 29 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	causo				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	•	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	. ,,	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		impliant Americanient (i	101-02-7.				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,6,9-11,13,14 and 19-31</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Geoffrey L. Knable/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1791					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment to claim 1 to in essence include the limitations of claims 21 and 23 presents new previously unclaimed combinations of features in the context of the embodiment including an innerliner and barrier resin layer. Note in particular that claims were not previously presented which required that the innerliner include both an inorganic filler and an inorganic layered compound (claims 13, 14, 20) in the innerliner embodiment, this requiring new consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: principally the reasons of record. The 1.132 declaration also does not clearly overcome the rejections of record as for example, the evidence presented therein does not appear to be reasonably commensurate in scope with the present claims. Note for example that the present claims are inclusive of a wide variety of inorganic fillers, not just silica, as well as a wide variety of resin barrier layers, not just polyvinyl alcohol, and is has not been convincingly argued why these results would have been understood as presenting a convincing and predictive showing for this broader claim scope. Additionally, it appears that at least some of these comparative examples would present arguably some expected problems due to the low, or even absent, filler loading levels (e.g. comparative examples L' and M' have no carbon black or silica filler which would seem to reasonably have been expected or predicted to lead to durability problems).